

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Huzeir Lekovic	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 2005	
10/776,648	02/10/2004		DWNS.62631		
Richard W. Hot	7590 02/21/2007	EXAMINER			
PO Box 70098			COONEY, JOHN M		
Rochester Hills, MI 48307			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1711		
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/21/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Ac	tion
Before the Filing of an	Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/776,648	LEKOVIC ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
John m. Cooney	1711	

,) Advisory Action	10/776,648	LEKOVIC ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	John m. Cooney	1711			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 08 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS		=			
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.		
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da).	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, e	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th			
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecause		
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		maliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)		
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 D. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		il be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-25</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affidate	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and		
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attack	ned.		
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
13.		John m Cooney Primary Examiner	7		
	//	Art Unit: 1711			

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The support for the amendments is not indicated and/or evident, and the amendment appears to raise new matter issues. The amendments set forth combinations of limitations to the claims which have not been previously submitted for consideration and would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejections over the combinations of teachings as set forth are maintained to properly set forth. The term of degree, "rigid" do not negate the combinations of references. Kurth et al. is maintained to recognize the employment of the hydrophobic oils of applicants' pending claims. Applicants' arguments concernin distinction based on degrees of water absorption characteristics are unpersuasive based on being directed towards unentered amendments, and the terminology of degree, "decreased water absorption characteristic", does not serve to set forth a meaningful limitation in the patentable sense as far as determining what amounts of "absorption" are included or excluded by this terminology.